

difference between the methods, although Applicants respectfully disagree that the methods of claim III are necessarily limited to in vitro methods.

Applicants suggest that the multiple similarities between the methods provide a basis for withdrawing the restriction requirement: Group I and III claims would not require significant additional searching or examination by the Examiner (if any). One could consider that the methods of Group I are a subset of the methods of Group III, because administering an anti-BGP antibody in a subject will result in contacting killer T cells. For searching these similar methods, one would expect to find any prior art related to one set of methods by searching the other set of methods.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the restriction requirement as to Groups I and III.

Respectfully submitted,

By: John R. Van Amsterdam  
John R. Van Amsterdam, Reg No. 40,212  
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210  
Telephone (617) 720-3500

Docket No. G00694.70002.US

Dated: October 10, 2002

**X10/10/02**